

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Figures	vi
List of Tables.....	vii
Introduction	1
Purpose.....	1
Approach	1
Benefits and Costs of Marine Reserves (no take areas).....	2
A. Potential Benefits	3
1. Non-Consumptive Users (Sport Divers and Wildlife Viewers)	3
2. Nonusers or Passive Users	3
3. Commercial Fishing and Kelp Harvesting	4
4. Recreational Fishing and Consumptive Diving	4
5. Scientific and Education Values.....	4
B. Potential Costs.....	5
1. Commercial Fishing and Kelp Harvesting	5
2. Recreational Fishing and Consumptive Diving.....	5
Outline of the Report	6
Chapter 1. A Socioeconomic Overview of the Study Area	7
Study Area Dependence on the CINMS.....	7
Significance	9
Conclusions about the Local Economies	11
Commercial Fishing Industry and Kelp Harvesting	11
Economic Impact Model	11
Baseline 1996-1999 Economic Impacts	14
Socioeconomic Profiles of Fishermen.....	15
Tri-County Fishermen.....	18
Consumer's Surplus	20
Economic Rent	21
Ethnographic Data Study.....	22
Recreation Industry	22
Economic Impact and Valuation Model.....	24
Expenditure Profiles.....	26
Residents vs. Nonresidents.....	27
Import Substitution/Double Counting Economic Impact	28
Consumer's Surplus	28
Ethnographic Data Survey.....	29
A Note on our Baseline Estimations.....	31
Chapter 2. Step 1 Analysis of Alternatives	32
Description of Alternatives.....	32
Introduction – Step 1 Analysis	39
Commercial Fishing and Kelp – Step 1 Analysis	39
Alternative 1	39
Alternative 2	41
Alternative 3	43
Alternative 4	45
Alternative 5	47
Preferred Alternative	49

Table of Contents (Continued)

Summary of Comparative Impacts of Alternatives	51
Impacts on Individual Fishermen	52
Recreation Industry	56
Recreation: Consumptive Activities – Step 1 Analysis	56
No Action Alternative	56
Preferred Alternative	56
Alternative 1	58
Alternative 2	60
Alternative 3	63
Alternative 4	64
Alternative 5	66
Aggregate Consumptive Impacts – Step 1 Analysis	70
Chapter 3 – Step 2 Analysis	71
Current Status of Exploited Fishing Stocks	71
Replenishment Effect/Stock Effects	72
Substitution/Relocation	72
Crowding/Congestion Effects	73
Quality Increases in Marine Reserves	73
Other Regulations	73
MLPA Process	74
MLMA Process	74
Existing Areas and Temporal Closures	75
Economic Conditions and Other Outside Forces and Internal Forces	75
Phasing of Marine Reserves	77
Pelagic or Highly Migratory Species	77
Commercial Fishing and Kelp – Step 2 Analysis	78
Commercial Fishing and Kelp, Analysis of Alternatives – Step 2	78
Alternative 1	81
Alternative 2	81
Alternative 3	81
Alternative 4	82
Alternative 5	82
Preferred Alternative	83
Recreation: Consumptive Activities – Step 2 Analysis	84
Substitution	84
Long-term Benefits from Replenishment Effects	84
Preferred Alternative	85
Alternative 1	86
Alternative 2	86
Alternative 3	87
Alternative 4	87
Alternative 5	87
Recreation Non-consumptive Users – Step 2 Analysis	89
Preferred Alternative	89
Alternative 1	91
Alternative 2	93
Alternative 3	95
Alternative 4	97
Alternative 5	99

Table of Contents (Continued)

Other Potential Benefits and Net Assessment	101
Nonuse or Passive Use Economic Value	101
What we Know about Nonuse Economic Values	102
Estimation of Nonuse Economic Values	102
Factors Supporting Positive Nonuse Economic Values	103
Scientific and Education Values	107
Net Assessment	108
Commercial Fishing and Kelp	108
Recreation Consumptive Activities	108
Non-consumptive Recreation Activities	108
Net National Benefits Approach versus Local Income and Employment	109
Endnotes	111
References	113
Appendices	119

Acknowledgements

As readers will discover, the contents of this report include a considerable amount of information. This report is a product based on the input and assistance of a great many people, not all which are listed here. Those listed below made special contributions that we would like to acknowledge. Any errors are solely our responsibility.

We would first like to thank the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary management and staff for all their assistance and support. Managers Ed Cassano and Matt Pickett provided the necessary contract and travel funds that were vital to filling many gaps in available socioeconomic information and supported our efforts in working with the different user groups. Sean Hastings and Michael Murray provided direction and information on how the Socioeconomic Panel interacted with the Marine Reserve Working Group (MRWG), the Pacific Fisheries Management Council and other entities. This effort would not have been possible without the excellent geographic information system support provided by Ben Waltenberger. Kathryn Hintergardt did an excellent job of making sure all project outputs were posted on the Sanctuary Web site for public access. Finally, a special thank you to Satie Airame for having the patience to work with us in translating the results of the Science Panel's findings into information we could integrate into the socioeconomic analyses.

Our Socioeconomic Panel and reviewers also deserve special recognition. Dr. Craig Barilotti of Sea Foam Enterprises, Inc. led the data collection effort for all the commercial fisheries other than squid/wetfish. Dr. Barilotti also organized a Fishermen's Data Committee to review and approve all the commercial fishing data maps. Dr. Caroline Pomeroy led the squid/wetfish data collection effort and also provided her expertise as a professional sociologist to the project. Dr. Charles Kolstad led the data collection efforts for the charter/party/guide service recreational industry. As one of the nation's leading natural resource and environmental economists, Dr. Kolstad also provided critical review and guidance on our economic impact models. Dr. James Lima of the U.S. Department of Interior's, Minerals Management Service provided important background literature and contacts for information relevant to the study and reviewed our methodologies.

We would like to acknowledge each of the members of the socioeconomic data collection teams. Dr. Barilotti's team members, Terry Hawkins and Chris Miller, did an excellent job of getting commercial fishermen to participate and provide the necessary project information. Terry also should receive special recognition for organizing a one-day workshop, where commercial fishermen worked with us in designing several marine reserve alternatives. This allowed the fishermen a much richer exposure to their information and the tools we used for analysis than they got in the MRWG process. Dr. Pomeroy's team included Doug Reese, Monica Hunter, Marc Los Huretos and Natalie McKinney. Doug, Monica and Marc worked with the squid/wetfish fishermen in compiling the information and Natalie provided data entry and checking. Dr. Pomeroy was also received valuable assistance from Sheli Smith with lodging while collecting information in the Long Beach area. Canetti's hosted many meetings with squid/wetfish fishermen. Will Daspit of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission provided invaluable assistance with PacFin data for the squid/wetfish fishery. Also, Manoj Shivilani and Daniel Suman of the University of Miami, Rosenstiel School of Atmospheric and Marine Science shared their experiences in gathering spatial catch information in the Tortugas Ecological Reserve of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

Bevin Ashenmiller deserves special recognition for her work in the recreational for hire data collection as part of Dr. Kolstad's team. Her efforts resulted in a Census not a sample of all operators in the CINMS. This was a major achievement. We would also like to thank Jae Yi for his contribution to the Kolstad team effort.

We would also like to acknowledge the assistance of several National Marine Fisheries Service economists on the West Coast of the U.S. in helping us understand the various data sources and available literature on the economics of the California marine fisheries. We would like to thank Cindy Thomson, Dale Squires, Jim Hastie, Sam Herrick, Wes Silverthorne, Stephen Freese and Dave Colpo.

Jim Seeger of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission provided us with the Fishery Economics Assessment Model (FEAM). We could not have done the economic impacts of the marine reserves on the local economies without this invaluable contribution. We would also like to thank Wade Van Buskirk of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission for assistance and understanding of the RecFin data. A special thank you to Dr. Linwood Pendleton and Steven Lutz of the University of Southern California for sharing their economic research on the Southern California squid fishery and Orlando Amoroso for his insights about the fishermen from the San Pedro fleet.

The California Department of Fish and Game provided enormous support for our efforts. Without the fundamental data and information support from the Department, none of this would have been possible. We would first like to thank Patty Wolf and Marija Vojkovich for paving the way for us and our contractors in getting access to the necessary commercial and recreational fishing data. We would like to extend a very special thank you to Joanna Eres and Jana Robertson in providing the commercial fishing data and documentation, to Deborah Aseltine-Neilson for providing recreational fishing logbook data, to Dave Ono for the diving skiff survey data and Gina Wade for the geographic information system files for the existing protected areas in the study area.

At the beginning of the Marine Reserve Working Group (MRWG) process, we received valuable input from Environmental Defense. Rod Fujita and Jacob Kritzer did an excellent job of providing an overview of the socioeconomic information available for Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Their contribution gave us a running start in understanding available data sources and the socioeconomics of the immediate area surrounding the CINMS. We would also like to thank Astrid Scholz of Ecotrust, who served as a consultant to Environmental Defense, for her contributions on nonuse or passive economic use values and her review and advice on our analyses.

We would like to thank Susan Smith of the Channel Islands National Park for the information on private boating activities around the islands and Jeff Nadler of the Professional Association of Dive Operators (PADI) for information on divers. We would also like to thank Bob Tellefson, President of the Santa Barbara Kayakers Association, for providing background information and helping us with refining the data on kayaking.

Ron Little, of the University of Utah, provided us with profile information of commercial fishermen from the Santa Barbara, Ventura and San Luis Obispo counties. This information came from a study he conducted for the Minerals Management Service and allowed for comparisons with our survey data.

Several members of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) and the Marine Reserve Working Group (MRWG) provided us with valuable information and contacts, which were a tremendous help. Rudy Scott provided us with a small business perspective. Dr. Craig Fusaro shared his many contacts and sources of information for the commercial fisheries. Deborah McArdle shared information compiled by Sea Grant on the charter/party/guide service industry, which helped us tremendously with that industry. Gary Davis directed us to the appropriate contacts for information at the Channel Islands National Park. Neil Guglielmo hosted a meeting with members of the squid/wetfish fishery so we could explain our efforts and how their information would be used in the process. Neil's efforts in getting the squid/wetfish fishermen involved contributed greatly to Dr. Pomeroy's team success. Finally, we would like to thank Dale Glantz of ISP Alginates for working with us in developing the economic impact model for kelp. Dale provided all the map data and all the details we needed to construct the economic impact model for kelp.

List of Figures

Figure 1.	Potential Ecological/Biological Benefits and Costs of Marine Reserves	2
Figure 2.	Socioeconomic Impact Area for the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS)	7
Figure 3.	Economic Impact Model for Commercial Fisheries in the CINMS	12
Figure 4.	Economic Impact Model and Valuation Model for the Recreation Industry in the CINMS	25
Figure 5.	Alternative 1	33
Figure 6.	Alternative 2	34
Figure 7.	Alternative 3	35
Figure 8.	Alternative 4	36
Figure 9.	Alternative 5	37
Figure 10.	Preferred Alternative	38

List of Tables

Chapter 1

1.1.	Selected Socioeconomic Measures for Description of Impact Areas	8
1.2.	Personal Income and Employment by County 1999	8
1.3.	Local/Regional Economic Dependence on CINMS: Personal Income, 1999	9
1.4.	Local/Regional Economic Dependence on CINMS: Employment, 1999	10
1.5.	Commercial Fishing Ex Vessel Value for the CDFG 22 Block Definition of the CINMS.....	13
1.6.	Income to Ex Vessel Value Multipliers: Ventura Harbor	14
1.7.	Economic Impact of Commercial Fishing and Kelp Harvesting: Baseline Annual Average 1996-1999	15
1.8.	Commercial Fishing: Multi-Species Fishery, Barilotti Sample.....	15
1.9.	Socioeconomic Profiles: Commercial Fishermen, Barilotti Sample	16
1.10.	Socioeconomic Profiles: Squid/Wetfish Fishermen, Pomeroy Sample	18
1.11.	Comparative Profiles: Tri-County Fishermen	19
1.12.	Relative Supply of Selected CINMS Commercial Species, 1999	21
1.13.	Number of Marine Recreational Fishing Trips in Southern California: 1993-2000	23
1.14.	Summary of Trends in Marine Recreational Catch in Southern California: 1993-1998	24
1.15.	Changes in Top 20 Species in Marine Recreational Catch in Southern California, 2000	24
1.16.	Person-days of Recreation Activity in the CINMS, 1999	25
1.17.	Charter/Party Operations in the CINMS, 1999	26
1.18.	Expenditure Profiles for Recreation Activities in the CINMS, 1999	27
1.19.	Economic Impact of Charter/Party Boat Fishing in Ventura County from Activity in the CINMS, 1999	29
1.20.	Consumer's Surplus Value for Recreation Activities.....	30
1.21.	Baseline Consumptive Recreation Activity.....	30
1.22.	Baseline Non-consumptive Recreation Activity	31

Chapter 2

2.1.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 1 on Ex Vessel Value by Species Group – Step 1 Analysis	40
2.2.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 1 on Ex Vessel Value by Port – Step 1 Analysis	40
2.3.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 1 on Total Income by County – Step 1 Analysis	41
2.4.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 1 on Total Employment by County – Step 1 Analysis	41
2.5.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 2 on Ex Vessel Value by Species Group – Step 1 Analysis	42
2.6.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 2 on Ex Vessel Value by Port – Step 1 Analysis	42
2.7.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 2 on Total Income by County – Step 1 Analysis	43
2.8.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 2 on Total Employment by County – Step 1 Analysis	43
2.9.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 3 on Ex Vessel Value by Species Group – Step 1 Analysis	44
2.10.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 3 on Ex Vessel Value by Port – Step 1 Analysis	44

List of Tables (Continued)

2.11.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 3 on Total Income by County – Step 1 Analysis	45
2.12.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 3 on Total Employment by County – Step 1 Analysis	45
2.13.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 4 on Ex Vessel Value by Species Group – Step 1 Analysis	46
2.14.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 4 on Ex Vessel Value by Port – Step 1 Analysis	46
2.15.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 4 on Total Income by County – Step 1 Analysis	47
2.16.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 4 on Total Employment by County – Step 1 Analysis	47
2.17.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 5 on Ex Vessel Value by Species Group – Step 1 Analysis	48
2.18.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 5 on Ex Vessel Value by Port – Step 1 Analysis	48
2.19.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 5 on Total Income by County – Step 1 Analysis	49
2.20.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of Alternative 5 on Total Employment by County – Step 1 Analysis	49
2.21.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of the Preferred Alternative on Ex Vessel Value by Species Group – Step 1 Analysis	50
2.22.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of the Preferred Alternative on Ex Vessel Value by Port – Step 1 Analysis.....	50
2.23.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of the Preferred Alternative on Total Income by County – Step 1 Analysis.....	51
2.24.	Commercial Fishing & Kelp: Impact of the Preferred Alternative on Total Employment by County – Step 1 Analysis	51
2.25.	Commercial Fishing and Kelp: Summary of Impacts by Alternative – Step 1 Analysis.....	52
2.26.	Summary of Ranges of Potential Losses of Income to Individual Fishermen: Barilotti Sample - Step 1 Analysis	53
2.27.	Summary of Ranges of Potential Losses of Income to Individual Squid/Wetfish Fishermen – Step 1 Analysis	53
2.28.	Summary of Impact on Income of Individual Fishermen: Barilotti Sample – Step 1 Analysis.....	54
2.29.	Summary of Impact on Income of Individual Squid/Wetfish Fishermen – Step 1 Analysis.....	55
2.30.	Summary: Recreation Consumptive Activities – Preferred Alternative – Step 1 Analysis.....	57
2.31.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Preferred Alternative – Total – Step 1 Analysis.....	57
2.32.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Preferred Alternative – State Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	58
2.33.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Preferred Alternative – Federal Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	58
2.34.	Summary: Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 1 – Step 1 Analysis.....	59
2.35.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 1 – Total – Step 1 Analysis.....	59
2.36.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 1 – State Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	60
2.37.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 1 – Federal Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	60

List of Tables (Continued)

2.38.	Summary: Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 2 – Step 1 Analysis.....	61
2.39.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 2 – Total – Step 1 Analysis.....	61
2.40.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 2 – State Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	62
2.41.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 2 – Federal Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	62
2.42.	Summary: Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 3 – Step 1 Analysis.....	63
2.43.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 3 – Total – Step 1 Analysis.....	63
2.44.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 3 – State Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	64
2.45.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 3 – Federal Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	64
2.46.	Summary: Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 4 – Step 1 Analysis.....	65
2.47.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 4 – Total – Step 1 Analysis.....	65
2.48.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 4 – State Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	66
2.49.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 4 – Federal Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	66
2.50.	Summary: Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 5 – Step 1 Analysis.....	67
2.51.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 5 – Total – Step 1 Analysis.....	67
2.52.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 5 – State Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	68
2.53.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Alternative 5 – Federal Waters – Step 1 Analysis.....	68
2.54.	Summary of Impacts on Consumptive Recreation – Step 1 Analysis	69
2.55.	Aggregate Consumptive Activities: Summary of Impacts by Alternative – Step 1 Analysis.....	70
2.56.	Habitat Protection per Dollar of Impact on Income	70

Chapter 3

3.1.	Commercial Fishing and Kelp: Trends and Status of Stocks	72
3.2.	Commercial Fishing and Kelp: Impacts Relative to Step 1 Analysis.....	80
3.3.	Recreational Consumptive Activities: Impacts Relative to Step 1 Analysis	85
3.4.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Preferred Alternative – Total (Baseline 1999)	90
3.5.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Preferred Alternative – State Waters (Baseline 1999)	90
3.6.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Preferred Alternative – Federal Waters (Baseline 1999)	90
3.7.	Potential Benefits to Non-consumptive Users from the Preferred Alternative – Step 2 Analysis.....	91
3.8.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 1 – Total (Baseline 1999)	91
3.9.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 1 – State Waters (Baseline 1999)	92

List of Tables (Continued)

3.10.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 1 – Federal Waters (Baseline 1999)	92
3.11.	Potential Benefits to Non-consumptive Users from the Alternative 1 – Step 2 Analysis.....	93
3.12.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 2 – Total (Baseline 1999)	93
3.13.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 2 – State Waters (Baseline 1999)	94
3.14.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 2 – Federal Waters (Baseline 1999)	94
3.15.	Potential Benefits to Non-consumptive Users from the Alternative 2 – Step 2 Analysis.....	95
3.16.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 3 – Total (Baseline 1999)	95
3.17.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 3 – State Waters (Baseline 1999)	96
3.18.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 3 – Federal Waters (Baseline 1999)	96
3.19.	Potential Benefits to Non-consumptive Users from the Alternative 3 – Step 2 Analysis.....	97
3.20.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 4 – Total (Baseline 1999)	97
3.21.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 4 – State Waters (Baseline 1999)	98
3.22.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 4 – Federal Waters (Baseline 1999)	98
3.23.	Potential Benefits to Non-consumptive Users from the Alternative 4 – Step 2 Analysis.....	99
3.24.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 5 – Total (Baseline 1999)	99
3.25.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 5 – State Waters (Baseline 1999)	99
3.26.	Economic Impact Associated with Non-consumptive Activities – Alternative 5 – Federal Waters (Baseline 1999)	100
3.27.	Potential Benefits to Non-consumptive Users from the Alternative 5 – Step 2 Analysis.....	100
3.28.	Summary: Economic Impacts on Recreation Non-consumptive Activities – Step 2 Analysis.....	101
3.29.	Net Assessment: National Net Benefits of Marine Reserves in the CINMS	109

Appendices

A.	A Socioeconomic Overview of the Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties as it Relates to Marine Related Industries and Activities.....	A.1
B.	Data Collection and Estimation Methods Used for Commercial Fishing and Recreation Industry Use of the Channel Island National Marine Sanctuary	B.1
C.	Data Distributions and Exclusion Zones: Commercial Fishing and Recreation.....	C.1
D.	Commercial Fishing – Step 1 Analysis, Detailed Tables	D.1
E.	Recreation Consumptive Activities – Preferred Alternative – Step 1 Analysis, Detailed Tables	E.1
F.	Recreation Non-consumptive Activities – Baseline Activity Under the Preferred Alternative, Detailed Tables.....	F.1
G.	Preferred Alternative – Step 1 Analysis – By Area (Summary Tables for Commercial Fishing and Recreation).....	G.1